

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT				1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE 1 OF 16 PAGES
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 000002		3. EFFECTIVE DATE See Block 16c	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.	5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)	
6. ISSUED BY NASA/Johnson Space Center BR2/ Chrystal D. Wiseman 2101 NASA Parkway, Houston, TX 77058-3696		7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6) NASA/Johnson Space Center BR2/ Chrystal D. Wiseman 2101 NASA Parkway, Houston, TX 77058-3696			
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, county, State and ZIP Code)			(X)	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. NNJ15541361R	
			(X)	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 10/19/2015	
				10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.	
				10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)	
CODE		FACILITY CODE			

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

☐ The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers ☐ is extended, ☒ is not extended.

Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods:

(a) By completing items 8 and 15, and returning 3 copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment your desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)

13. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO MODIFICATION OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

CHECK ONE	A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.
<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).
<input type="checkbox"/>	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:
<input type="checkbox"/>	D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor ☐ is not, ☐ is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)

Human Resources Integrated Professional Services (HRIPS) - The purpose of Amendment 2 is to: 1) Provide the Government's response to industry questions received regarding the Final RFP (See attachment entitled Enclosure 2 - HRIPS RFP QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS) and update the Final RFP accordingly. See Enclosure 1 contained on pages 2 and 3 of this Amendment for further details outlining the changes included in this amendment.

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)		16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)	
		Chrystal D. Nevels, Contracting Officer	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA CHRYSTAL NEVELS <small>Do not write on this space. If you must, use the space on the back of this page.</small>	16C. DATE SIGNED
(Signature of person authorized to sign)		(Signature of Contracting Officer)	11/10/2015

ENCLOSURE 1
HRIPS Contract
Final RFP Change Summary

This document provides a summary of the changes that have occurred post-release of the Final RFP. The updates across the Final RFP include editorial and administrative changes, as well as changes in content, direction, and clarification. Important changes are identified below; however, it is the offeror's responsibility to review the entire Amendment to ensure all updates are identified and accounted for in the offeror's proposal.

GENERAL – OVERALL CLARIFICATION

- The proposal due date is November 20, 2015 per Provision L.10, Proposal Marking and Delivery. Offerors shall ignore any conflicting references to due dates that do not state November 20, 2015.

SECTION I – CONTRACT CLAUSES

- Section I, Contract Clauses was amended to include Clause I.14, Notification of Competition Limited to Eligible 8(a) Concerns (June 2003) in full text.

SECTION L – INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICES TO OFFERORS

- Section L.12 Communications Regarding This Solicitation, 2nd paragraph: Changed deadline for submitting questions regarding this solicitation from October 30, 2015 to November 2, 2015. **[This update was made in Amendment 1 to the Final RFP]**
- Section L.16.2, Table L-2: Updated language to change “*Key Personnel” to “*Key Personnel Resume”.
- Section L.17.2(c), Past Performance – Volume II: Updated to list “Key Personnel Resumes as Attachment L-3”.
- Section L.17.3 (d)2. Excel Pricing Model: Updated Tab TOPT-SR to reflect 1246 hours for all positions, correcting 1246.2 hours for Subject Matter Expert-Mentor position.
- Section L.17.3 (d)2. Excel Pricing Model: Updated Tab TOPT-SR to include line item for Phase-In price.
- Section L.17.3 (d)3.a.- *Price Template Instructions for Fully Burdened Rates Templates (FBR)*: Deleted language to remove references to Overhead Template (OHT), G&A Template (GAT), and Minor Subcontracting Template (MST).

- Section L.17.5 (a): Section B - B.6 (A) has been corrected to B.7 (A).
- Section L.17.5 (a): Section J - Updated to read, "*Offerors shall submit DRD's with the proposal as described in Section L.17.1 and Section L.17.4.* The remaining DRDs shall be submitted in accordance with the applicable DRD's submission criteria.
- Section L.17.5 (a): Section I – Updated to remove the requirement to, "*Insert the name of the cognizant SBA Office*" in Clause I.7 and replace with the requirement to, "*Insert the name of the applicable 8(a) contractor*" in Clause I.14.

DATA REQUIREMENTS DESCRIPTION (DRDs)

- DRD HRIPS-02 Management Operating and Staffing Plan Section G: Wage Determination (WD) 2005-2515, Revision 18 has been updated to confirm compliance with WD 05-2516 (Revision.19) is required.
- DRD HRIPS-07 Information Technology (IT) Security and Management Plan (Government Furnished Services), Item 8.E.ii: Updated to state, "the approved plan becomes a part of the contract as Attachment J-08, Information Technology (IT) Security Plan."
- DRD HRIPS-08 Phase-In Plan, Item 8.Delivery and Maintenance: Updated to state, "Initial submission with proposal. Changes shall be incorporated as required by change page or complete reissue. The Phase-In Plan becomes a part of the contract as Attachment J-06, Phase-In Plan."

OTHER

- As requested, the HRIPS Excel Pricing Model (updated in Amendment 2) is being posted as a separate excel file as well as being embedded in Section L.
- As requested, the HRIPS Past Performance Information Matrix (the same version as what was released in the Final RFP) is being posted as a separate excel file as well as being embedded in Section L.

**ENCLOSURE 2 –
HRIPS RFP QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

Question 1

Would the Government please clarify the due date for questions to be submitted?

Answer 1

Questions regarding this solicitation must be presented in writing and shall be submitted electronically to the Contracting Officer, Chrystal Wiseman at chrystal.d.wiseman@nasa.gov by November 2, 2015 by 1:30pm (local time) in order that the answers may be obtained and disseminated in a timely manner, since it is not expected that a proposal submission date will be extended.

Question 2

Are there any other contracts at the Center performing the same requirements as those contained in the HRIPS contract?

Revised Answer 2

No. The requirements contained in the HRIPS RFP are unique to the specific needs of the Human Resources Organization at Johnson Space Center. There are no other contracts that will be performing the same requirements. However, this solicitation is a follow-on to the predecessor contract The Human Resources Management, Operations and Development Support Services (HRMODSS), Contract No. NNJ11JA01B currently awarded to GAPSI-Banner Joint Venture. The HRMODSS period of performance is 05/01/2011 – 4/30/2016.

Question 3

Where can I find the files for J4, J5, J6, J7, and J8? The PDF copy of the RFP says they are attached, but being that it is a PDF, there are no attached files.

Answer 3

Attachments J4, J5, J6, J7, and J8 are not provided with the RFP. See below for further explanation.

- Attachment J-4, Management Operating and Staffing Plan is currently a place holder in the model contract. DRD HRIPS-02 entitled "Management Operating and Staffing Plan" provides instructions to the offerors on the content required. DRD HRIPS-02 is due with submission of offerors' proposals.
- Attachment J-5, Safety and Health Plan is currently a place holder in the model contract. DRD HRIPS-01 entitled "Safety and Health Plan" provides instructions to the offerors on the content required. DRD HRIPS-01 is due from the awardee during the Phase-In period.
- Attachment J-6, Phase-In Plan is currently a place holder in the model contract. DRD HRIPS-08 entitled "Phase-In Plan" provides instructions to

the offerors on the content required. DRD HRIPS-08 is due with submission of offerors' proposals.

- Attachment J-7, Organizational Conflict of Interest Plan is currently a place holder in the model contract. DRD HRIPS-06 entitled "Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) Plan" provides instructions to the offerors on the content required. DRD HRIPS-06, Section 8.(c).5 is due with submission of offerors' proposals and the full OCI Plan is due from the awardee before the end of the contract phase-in period.
- Attachment J-8, Information Technology (IT) Security Plan is currently a place holder in the model contract. DRD HRIPS-07 entitled "Information Technology (IT) Security and Management Plan (Government Furnished Services)" provides instructions to the offerors on the content required. DRD HRIPS-07 is due from the awardee 30 days after contract award. The approved plan becomes a part of the contract under Section J-08 of the contract. Please note Amendment 2 to NNJ15541361R which updates the "Submissions" Section in DRD HRIPS-07 for further clarification.

Question 4

Is this a new requirement? If not, can you please provide the name of the incumbent, the current contract value and eligibility criteria to re-compete?

Answer 4

No, the HRIPS solicitation is not a new requirement. This is a follow-on to the Human Resources Management, Operations and Development Support Services (MODSS) Contract No. NNJ11JA01B at the Johnson Space Center. The current incumbent/prime contractor is GAPSI-Banner Joint Venture. Contract NNJ11JA01B'S current contract value for all task orders issued to date is \$15.9M and not-to-exceed (NTE) value of the contract is \$24.9M.

This solicitation is an 8(a) Set-aside. NAICS Code: 541612 – Human Resources Consulting Services; Size Standard: \$15,000,000.

Additional information can be found at: <http://procurement.jsc.nasa.gov/hrips/>

Question 5

Work can be performed on-site / off-site?

Answer 5

The Contractor shall be responsible for providing services to the Johnson Space Center which includes: the Sonny Carter Training Facility (SCTF), Ellington Field, the White Sands Test Facility (WSTF), Las Cruces, New Mexico, and other NASA-provided operating locations that may be determined subsequent to contract award.

As indicated in Clause G.2, Installation-Accountable Government Property, Office space is provided to the current contractor performing these services. Office space will be available for the successful offeror of this competition. Most contractual requirements will require on-site presence to perform the work. JSC policies support telework and work from anywhere for both civil servant and contractor employees.

Question 6

How many persons have been allocated on the site by the current incumbent?

Answer 6

There are currently 22 full time equivalent employees on the existing MODSS contract. All 22 employees currently sit on-site at the Johnson Space Center.

Question 7

We are requesting clarification on section L.17.2 (a) as it is unclear to us how many past performances the government wished to see in the volume. Please explain whether the government is expecting to see three to five references for the ENTIRE Past Performance volume (inclusive of prime, major subcontractor, and program manager references), or three to five references PER teaming members (i.e., at least nine references for a team that consists of a prime, major sub, and a program manager). As all offerors are required to send out their past performance questionnaires to their references very soon in order to ensure timely return to the government, we are hoping to receive clarity on this issue quickly.

Answer 7

The Government is **NOT** expecting to see three to five references for the ENTIRE Past Performance volume (**inclusive** of prime, major subcontractor, and program manager references).

Per section L.17.2 (a), "Offerors, including joint ventures, major subcontractors (subcontracts with an estimated annual value greater than \$1,000,000) and the proposed program manager shall **each** provide information on **up to** five past contracts.

Question 8

There are references in section 17.3 to the Overhead rate template (OHT) ; G&A rate template (GAT); and the minor subcontractor Pricing Template (MST); however, these are not included in the Excel Pricing Model templates. Please clarify.

Answer 8

The references to the OHT, GAT, and MST are not required. Therefore, Amendment 2 to the NNJ15541361R is updated to remove references to such templates in Section L.17.3 Price Factor – Volume III, Paragraph 3.a.- *Price Template Instructions for Fully Burdened Rates Templates (FBR)*.

Question 9

Is this only for 8 (a) companies to bid on or can any 100% owned DAV Veterans owned company bid on it too?

Answer 9

Only 8(a) companies or Joint Ventures are eligible to bid as the Prime Contractor. 8(a) eligibility status is determined by the Small Business Administration (SBA).

Question 10

I attended the HRIPS Pricing Session and would like to find out how I can get a copy of the pricing template used in the examples. There are not in the presentation slides.

Answer 10

The pricing template used in the examples presented at the HRIPS Pricing Session are contained in the Final RFP Section L, Provision L.17.3. Price Factor – Volume III, Paragraph d.2 – CD Price Proposal Organization as an attachment entitled “Excel Pricing Model”.

Question 11

Reference: L.17.2-Safety and Health Data-Bullet 3-Experience Modification Rate Computation Formula. We have never submitted the computation formula used as it is lengthy and not compiled by our company. Please verify the need for this information?

Answer 11

NASA understands this information is typically compiled by the insurance carrier (and not the company). However, this information is necessary for proposal evaluation.

Question 12

L.17.2-Safety and Health Data-Bullet 4-Letter from Insurance Carrier. Letter from insurance carrier summarizing the offeror's liability and lawsuit history related to safety and health performance for the past 3 years including a history of changes to the experience modifier rate. Please verify the need for this information?

Answer 12

Yes, NASA verifies this information is necessary and is used in the Past Performance evaluation.

Question 13

NASA RFP Letter to Prospective Offerors dated October 19, 2015, Enclosure 1. The Change Summary bullet referencing L.16.2 (a) states a new due date of November 16, 2015 but Section L.16.2(a) of the RFP states the proposal is due on November 20, 2015. Would the Government please clarify the due date for this RFP?

Answer 13

Proposals are due November 20, 2015 by 1:30pm (local time).

Question 14

Attachment J-10, Wage Determination 05-2516 (Rev 19); DRD HRIPS-02, Management Operating and Staffing Plan, Section G. DRD HRIPS-02 refers to WD 05-2515 (Rev. 18), but the WD provided as Attachment J-10 is WD 05-2516.

Did the Government intend to incorporate an even-numbered Wage Determination?
Would the Government provide clarification for the WD?

Answer 14

The Attachment J-10, Wage Determination 05-2516 (Rev 19) is correct. The language in DRD HRIPS-02, Management Operating and Staffing Plan, Section G is updated in NNJ15541361R Amendment 2 to reflect this clarification.

Question 15

L.17.2 (c). Past Performance Matrix of Relevant Experience-Statement of Work (SOW) Section. Is the Government requesting that bidders address the major sections (i.e., 1.0, 2.0, 3.0.....) or is the Government requesting that bidders go to the 3-digit Section level (i.e., 5.10.1, 5.10.2, 5.10.3.....)?

Answer 15

When completing the Past Performance Matrix of Relevant Experience, at a minimum, the offeror shall address and complete the SOW section to the top WBS level (2.0, 3.0, 4.0, etc.) in which they have relevant experience. The Government does not have a preference on whether the offerors address at the major section (5.0) or the 3-digit section level (5.10.1). Offerors are reminded, however, that the narrative rational supporting its assertion that a given past performance contract is relevant to the HRIPS Statement of Work will take precedence over the matrix in the event of a conflict.

Question 16

Reference: L.17.2 Past Performance - Volume II (Pg. L12)

- a) Offerors, including joint ventures, major subcontractors (subcontracts with an estimated annual value greater than \$1,000,000) and the proposed program manager shall each provide information on up to five past contracts (subject to the page limitation constraints)
- b) Only contract period of performances within 3 years from the date of the HRIPS solicitation will be considered in the past performance evaluation.

What's the minimum past performances required to be qualified and is it mandatory to include the program manager's past performance details?

Answer 16:

In accordance with L.17.2(a), "Offerors with no past performance experience shall so state." As stated in section M.2.2, "In accordance with FAR 15.305, an offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, a rating of neutral will be assigned." The "Neutral" confidence rating described in M.2.2 further clarifies: "In the case of an

offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance [see FAR 15.305(a) (2) (ii) and (iv)].”

Yes, it is mandatory to include past performance for the proposed program manager.

Question 17

Reference:

- a) Offerors, including joint ventures, major subcontractors (subcontracts with an estimated annual value greater than \$1,000,000) and the proposed program manager shall each provide information on up to five past contracts (subject to the page limitation constraints)
- b) Only contract period of performances within 3 years from the date of the HRIPS solicitation will be considered in the past performance evaluation.

Section **L.17.2 Past Performance – Volume II** doesn't provide instructions to include resumes. Please clarify under which volume resumes needs to be attached/included.

Answer 17

Per Attachment L-3 Key Personnel Resume, Offerors shall complete one form for each proposed Key Person. The resume shall not exceed two pages.

Per section L.16.1(d), resumes are required for all key personnel proposed. Per section L.16.2 Proposal Arrangement, Page Limitations, Copies, and Due Dates, Table L-2 Overview of Proposal Volumes, Page Limitations, Copies, and Format, Key Personnel Resumes shall be part of Volume II Past Performance. They are excluded from the Volume II overall page limit, however still have a page limit of 2 pages per resume. Table L-2: Overview of Proposal Volumes, Page Limitations, Copies, and Format is updated to change “*Key Personnel*” to “*Key Personnel Resume*” in NNJ15541361R Amendment 2. Section L.17.2(c), is also updated to list “Key Personnel Resumes” as an item required to be submitted in the past performance volume.

Question 18

Reference: L.16.2 Proposal Arrangement, Page Limitations, Copies and Due Dates (Pg. L8)

(f) Electronic copies of the proposal shall be prepared and submitted in Microsoft Office® 2010 applications (Word and Excel). Further, the Microsoft Excel spreadsheets shall be submitted in Microsoft Excel format, not in a scanned Microsoft Word or Adobe PDF file. Microsoft Word documents shall be submitted in Microsoft Word format, not in an Adobe PDF file.

- 1) Is it mandatory to submit electronic copies in Microsoft Office® 2010 applications (Word and Excel)? Is it okay to use the latest versions (Microsoft Office® 2013)?

Answer 18

Yes, it is a requirement to prepare and submit electronic copies in Microsoft Office® 2010 applications (Word and Excel) To ensure compatibility when opening and evaluating Offerors' proposals, Microsoft Office® 2010 is **required**. Instructions on how to convert Microsoft Office 2013 to 2010 are available on the Microsoft website.

Question 19

Please let us know the name of the current incumbent and kindly confirm if the incumbent is bidding for this RFP?

Answer 19

The current incumbent/prime contractor is GAPSI-Banner Joint Venture. The Government does not know if GAPSI-Banner Joint Venture plans to propose.. We are only aware of all interested parties at this point. Interested parties can found at: <http://procurement.jsc.nasa.gov/hrips/> .

Question 20

Reference: L.17.2 (d) and (e). May we interpret that the instructions provided in L.17.2.(d) and (e) allow offerors to determine which entities or proposed key personnel may additionally provide the requested information requested in L.17.2 (a-c)?

Answer 20

The Government requires Offerors to follow the instructions provided in L.12.2 – Past Performance when submitting past performance questionnaires. Per L.17.2(d), any other **organizational entity** (parent or affiliated company, division(s), business units, or segments of your company, which is considered to provide meaningful involvement in contract performance, shall submit past performance questionnaires.

Question 21

Reference: L.17.2. "Offerors, including joint ventures, major subcontractors (subcontracts with an estimated annual value greater than \$1,000,000) and the proposed program manager shall each provide information on up to five past contracts (subject to the page limitation constraints)."

There are subcontractors who will provide a technically important role on teams, and whose capabilities are critical to successfully delivering services for HRIPS requirements, but whose annual subcontract value may come just under \$1,000,000. Will the Government consider enhancing the definition of "major subcontractors" to include those the Prime deems as technically critical to the success of their solution, and of JSC's HRIPS program?

Answer 21

The Government's position that major subcontractors are subcontracts with an estimated annual value greater than \$1,000,000 remains the same.

However, Per L.17.2(d), any entity that is to provide meaningful involvement in contract performance shall submit past performance information.

Question 22

Reference: L.17.5 (a). B.6 (A) – Complete the table of Fully Burdened Labor Rates for FFP TOs. It seems that the table referenced is actually located in B.7 (a). Please clarify this is the table an offeror is to fill out for the Model Contract.

Answer 22

Section L.17.5 (a), B.6(A) is corrected to read B.7(A).

NNJ15541361R Amendment 2 updates Section L, Provision L.17.5, Model Contract – Volume V to correct this error.

Question 23

Reference: L.16.2 (b). For electronic copies, each volume shall be placed in its own folder. (Page L-8). Please clarify whether you mean a physical folder populated with CD-Rs (or USB flash drives) or electronic file folders within a CD-R.

Answer 23

For electronic copies, each volume shall be placed in its own electronic folder.

Question 24

Reference: L.17.1 (b). You should limit your response to this scenario to a maximum of five pages and should be in compliance with instructions given in L.16.2.

Are the 5 pages for the Sample Scenario excluded from the 40 page limit for the Technical Acceptability volume?

Answer 24

No, the maximum of five pages for the Sample Scenario are **not** excluded from the 40 page limit for the Volume I Technical Acceptability.

Question 25

Reference: L.16.2 (c). Sections of the proposal which are page limited shall be prepared and submitted using non-compressed Arial font with single-spaced 12 point Text in diagrams, charts, tables, artwork, and photographs shall be no smaller than 12 point text size. Diagrams, charts, tables, artwork and photographs shall not be used to circumvent the text size limitations of the proposal.

We understand the Government's desire that proposal content be legible and easy to read and that diagrams, charts, tables etc. are not used to circumvent this desire. Currently the requirements are that the content, tables and graphics be 12 point. Would the Government consider allowing tables and graphics to be 10 point font while the font for the proposal content remain the same? The goal is to have artwork and tables only take up one page (not a foldout) while staying legible and easy to read.

Answer 25

The solicitation requires use of Arial 12 point text for text in diagrams, charts, tables, artwork, and photographs.

Question 26

Reference: DRD HRIPS-02 (page J-02-12). Discussion of the company's fringe benefit policies and practices, including leave programs. The RFP asks for The Contractor's Employees Fringe Benefits. Given the robust fringe benefits that our organization provides, we have substantial detail on our benefits (e.g., Medical – in and out of network co-pays, which may vary by type of service- e.g., x-ray vs. mammogram). Would the Government consider allowing this more detailed information to be provided in an Appendix while keeping a summary statement in the proposal body?

Answer 26

Since DRD HRIPS-02 is part of Volume I's 40 page limit, it is up to the offeror to determine the amount of detailed information to submit in their proposal. Per section M.2.1 Technical Acceptability Factor (Volume I), "The proposed Management Operating and Staffing Plan (DRD-HRIPS-02) will be evaluated for reasonableness, feasibility, and completeness.

Question 27

Reference: L.17.2 (c). Complete the incorporated matrix as part of your response. In the event of a conflict between the narrative and the relevance matrix, the narrative will take precedence as the offeror's intended response.

Is the past performance relevance matrix included in the page limitation?

Answer 27

Yes the past performance relevance matrix is included in the page limitation per section L.16.2 (b), Table L-2.

Question 28

Reference: L.17.3 (d) (3) (a). Offerors are required to identify the percentage of incumbent workforce that they intend to pay at their current incumbent direct labor rates by SLC. The government provided current incumbent labor rates in the HRIPS Technical Library, but the list seems to be incomplete. Can you also provide rates for the labor categories not already listed (e.g., Program Manager)?

Answer 28

The incumbent labor rates provided in the HRIPS Technical Library is complete and include all incumbent workforce direct labor rates currently on staff for the MODSS contract. Those Standard Labor Categories not listed in the HRIPS Technical Library are not being utilized by the current contractor, and therefore, are not provided in the technical library. NASA does not disclose the Program Manager rate for the incumbent contractor.

Question 29

Reference: L.17.5 (a). Offerors shall submit DRD's with the proposal as described in Section L.17.1 (DRD HRIPS-02, DRD HRIPS-08).

Should an offeror include completed (filled-out) DRDs in Volume V as well as the responses in Volume I?

Answer 29

No. DRD HRIPS-02 and DRD HRIPS-08 shall be submitted with the proposals and evaluated under Volume I – Technical Acceptability. Offerors are not required to include the completed DRDs HRIPS-02, DRD HRIPS-08 in Volume V. These DRDs, once approved, will be incorporated into the contract during the phase-in period

Question 30

Reference: L.17.5 (a). I.7 – Insert the name of the cognizant SBA Office. Where should the offeror insert the name of the cognizant SBA office? There doesn't seem to be a place to insert this information in Section I.7.

Answer 30

The Government acknowledges that there is not a place to insert information in Clause I.7 of the contract. NNJ15541361R Amendment 2 updated Section I to include Clause I. 14, Notification of Competition Limited to Eligible 8(A) Concerns (June 2003). Offerors are instructed to complete the fill-in in Clause I.14 instead. As a result, Section L, Provision L.17.5, Model Contract – Volume V was updated to remove references to the requirement to "Insert the name of the cognizant SBA Office in Clause I.7" and replace with the requirement to "insert the applicable 8(a) contractor name" in Clause I.14.

Question 31

Reference: DRD HRIPS-02, A.4. (4) Performance evaluation summary to include a discussion of performance management and staffing approach including any metrics the Contractor will use to ensure high quality services are provided for each SOW element. The purpose of the performance evaluation summary is to ensure the identification of very minor, if any, deficiencies with no adverse effect on overall performance of the SOW.

This requirement is unclear. Please clarify what is meant by "staffing approach" in the context of Performance Evaluation.

Answer 31

In the context of performance evaluation, the offeror shall provide its approach to staffing and retaining employees to ensure high quality services of each SOW element.

Question 32

Reference: DRD HRIPS-02, A.4. (4) Performance evaluation summary to include a discussion of performance management and staffing approach including any metrics the Contractor will use to ensure high quality services are provided for each SOW element. The purpose of the performance evaluation summary is to ensure the identification of very minor, if any, deficiencies with no adverse effect on overall performance of the SOW. This requirement is unclear.

Please clarify the intent of identifying "very minor, if any, deficiencies with no adverse effect on overall performance."

Answer 32

The Government's intent is for the offeror to summarize a discussion for identifying and correcting even minor performance deficiencies early that could, if not corrected, impact overall contract performance.

Question 33

Reference: DRD HRIPS-02, A.4. (4) Performance evaluation summary to include a discussion of performance management and staffing approach including any metrics the Contractor will use to ensure high quality services are provided for each SOW element. The purpose of the performance evaluation summary is to ensure the identification of very minor, if any, deficiencies with no adverse effect on overall performance of the SOW.

Due to page limitations, please confirm that Offerors should only discuss an approach to performance evaluation and metrics in a general way. There is not enough space to propose metrics for "each SOW element."

Answer 33

Since DRD HRIPS-02 is part of Volume I's 40 page limit, it is up to the offeror to determine the amount of detailed information to submit in their proposal. Per section M.2.1 Technical Acceptability Factor (Volume I), "The proposed Management Operating and Staffing Plan (DRD-HRIPS-02) will be evaluated for reasonableness, feasibility, and completeness.

Question 34

Reference: DRD HRIPS-02, A.1 and B.8. Requirement A.1 refers to "Program Management Functions" and Requirement B.8 refers to "Management Functions." Can you explain the difference in information you are seeking from these two requirements?

Answer 34

DRD HRIPS-02 A.1 is instructing the offeror to provide an overall management approach and quality control system to satisfy the contract requirements, including program management functions. DRD HRIPS-02 B.8 is instructing the offeror to provide a description of the Contractor's organization including the Management functions, roles, and responsibilities, and the method for integrating operation plans for all primary functional work areas. It is up to the offeror to

determine the level of detail to propose in each section of the DRD. Offerors should be mindful of the Volume I 40 page limitation.

Question 35

Reference: DRD HRIPS-02, F. Please confirm that Offerors should only include fringe benefit information from the prime offeror in this section.

Answer 35

The offeror should include the fringe benefit information of the company where the employee's will be covered, whether it be a prime, major subcontractor(s), and/or joint venture.

Question 36

Reference: DRD HRIPS-02, B.1 and B.2. In DRD-02, "Management Operating and Staffing Plan," Can the Government please explain the difference in the "(1) Proposed organizational structure" requested in B(1), and the "(2) Organization chart" requested in B(2)?

Answer 36

DRD HRIPS-02, B.1 is instructing the offeror to provide a description of the Contractor's organization including proposed organizational structure for the HRIPS contract: including chart showing job titles, lines of authority and relationships between departments within the HRIPS contract; whereas DRD HRIPS-02, B.2 is instructing the offeror to provide a description of the Contractor's organization including organization chart identifying roles of all organizational elements and reporting relationships. It is up to the offeror to determine the level of detail to propose in each section.

Question 37

Reference: Excel Pricing Model, TOPT-SR; Table L-3, page L-16. Table L-3 indicates offerors must propose 1,246 hours per year for the Subject Matter Expert-Mentor position but the TOPT-SR tab in the EPM contains unrounded hours of 1,246.2 hours per year for the same position.

For consistency among offerors, would the Government please instruct offerors to use 1,246 hours per year for the Subject Matter Expert-Mentor in the EPM?

Answer 37

For consistency among offerors, the offerors shall use 1,246 hours instead of the 1,246.2 hours for the Subject Matter Expert - Mentor when populating the TOPT-SR. Tab TOPT-SR in the Excel Pricing Model is updated to reflect this direction and provided as an attachment to NNJ15541361R Amendment 2.

Question 38

Reference: L.17.2 (c), page L-13. Past Performance Matrix of Relevant Experience.

Is contractor developed format OK to submit in lieu of provided attachment?

Answer 38

No, the contractor developed format is not acceptable. Per section L.17.2 (c) offeror is instructed to complete the incorporated matrix as part of response.

Question 39

Reference: Excel Pricing Model, TOPT-SR; RFP page L-22, section b.; DRD HRIPS-08, page J-02-24, section 8.f

Page L-22 of the RFP states that “the bottom of the TOPT-SR includes a line item for a Phase-In price.” DRD HRIPS-08 also states in section f that the offeror should price Phase-In costs in the EPM. However, the TOPT-SR does not include a line for Phase-In. Does the Government want Phase-In costs to be included in the TOPT-SR?

Answer 39

Yes. The Government wants Phase-In cost to be included in the TOPT-SR. Tab TOPT-SR in the Excel Pricing Model is updated to reflect this direction and provided as an attachment to NNJ15541361R Amendment 2.